



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

LM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,936	01/26/2004	Wen-Yu Li	14213 B	9315
36672	7590	06/07/2004	EXAMINER	
CHARLES E. BAXLEY, ESQ. 90 JOHN STREET THIRD FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10038				NGUYEN, CHAU N
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2831		

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/764,936

Applicant(s)

LI, WEN-YU

Examiner

Chau N Nguyen

Art Unit

2831

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-13, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 14-16 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of each of the buses including a plurality of co-axially arranged cables as claimed in claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled

in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, each of the buses includes a coaxial cable (12). Claim 1 and the specification, on the other hand, disclose that each of the buses includes a plurality of co-axially arranged cables.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 2 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - in claim 2, line 2, delete "1",
 - in claim 16, line 1, change "17" to --15--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steele (4,835,394).

In the following rejection, it is assumed that each of the buses includes a coaxial cable.

Steele discloses a cladding structure comprising a plurality of serial buses (Figure 2), an insulating covering layer (22) surrounding the serial buses, a metallic plating layer (13) mounted on the covering layer, and a metallic protective layer (19) mounted on the plating layer, wherein each of the buses includes a coaxial cable, the covering layer surrounding an outer side of the serial buses to form an insulating layer to protect the serial buses, the plating layer being attached on a surface of the covering layer, and the protective layer being attached on a surface of the plating layer (re claim 1). Steele also discloses the serial buses being equally spaced from each other (re claim 2), the covering layer being made of PVC (re claim 4), the plating layer being made of copper to prevent an electromagnetic interference (re claim 7), and the plating layer forming an electromagnetic interference isolation layer on the surface of the covering layer (re claim 9). Re claims 8 and 12, it has been held that during examination, the patentability of a product-by-process claim is determined by the novelty and nonobviouness of the claimed product itself without consideration of the process, "sputter plating manner", for making it which is recited in the claim. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steele.

Steele discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the covering layer being made of Mylar, PU or a heat-resistant material, and the protective layer being made of a wear-resistant and anti-oxidant metallic material which is stainless steel. Although not specifically disclosed by Steele, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the cable of Steele by using Mylar or PU or a heat-resistant material for the covering layer and stainless steel for the protective layer since these materials are known in the art for being used as cable covering layer and cable protective layer respectively. In addition, it has been held that within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416 (re claims 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11).

Claims 13 and 17 additionally recites an isolation layer (cable jacket) mounted on a surface of the protective layer (19). Although not specifically disclosed by Steele, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide an isolation layer (a cable jacket) on the protective layer (19) of Steele to further protect the cable core from the environment since cable jacket is known in the art for being used to protect the cable core. It would also have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use rubber for the isolation layer in the modified cable of Steele since rubber is known in the art for being used as isolation material.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a structure comprising all the features as recited in the claims and in combination with the isolation layer being made of an indium and tin oxide to prevent an electromagnetic interference (re claim 14).

Cited Art

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mehnert and Steele disclose cables having two metallic layers covering an insulating layer.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831